

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

This Amendment and the following remarks are intended to fully respond to the Office Action dated August 25, 2004. Reconsideration of the rejection of the claims remaining in the application, as the rejection might apply to the original and amended claims in view of these remarks, is respectfully requested.

Claims 16 and 23-26 are now in the application. In this Response, claim 16 has been amended to write claim 22 in independent form, i.e. to incorporate the elements of claims 21 and 22, and claims 1-15, 17-22 and 27-36 have been canceled. Applicant reserves the right to file these canceled claims in a continuation application.

#### **Claim Rejections 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 16, and 23-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanson (USPN 5,963,861) in view of Shaffer.

The Hanson reference is directed to a mobile phone system and the Shaffer reference is directed to a telephone network routing system. Neither reference teaches the combination of a providing menu choices to the calling party, a GIS system working with X-Y coordinates, a service switching point and a service control point. The examiner cites the Hanson reference for presenting a menu of choices to the calling party and receiving from the calling party a selection based on the menu. Hanson does not provide the selection to the GIS system because Hanson does not have a GIS system.

In the Hanson reference, the examiner cites the MTSO as equivalent to service switch point and the HLR as equivalent to the service center point. Yet these mobile elements and landline elements are not equivalent devices. Further, the Shaffer reference teaches away from mobile telephones at FIGs. 1d and 1e. In FIG. 1d decision block 120 detects whether the calling number is from a mobile phone. If the calling phone is a mobile phone, the flow branches YES to exception handling block 128 in FIG. 1e. In other words Shaffer can not handle mobile phones. A person skilled in the art would not read Shaffer and think to combine Shaffer's use of GIS with Hanson's mobile phone system.

The combination of elements in Claim 16 is not obvious over Hanson in view of Shaffer at least because (1) the elements are not the same, and (2) Shaffer teaches away from the combination of GIS system with mobile phones. Therefore amended claim 16 (previously dependent claim 22) should be allowed. Claims 23-26 are dependent from claim 16 and should be allowed for the same reasons as discussed above for claim 16.

**Conclusion**

It is believed that no further fees are due with this Response. However, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiencies or credit any overpayment with respect to this patent application to deposit account number 13-2725.

In light of the above remarks and amendments, it is believed that the application is now in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested. Should any additional issues need to be resolved, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attempt to resolve those issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: November 3, 2004



Homer L. Knearl  
Homer L. Knearl #21,197  
MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.  
P.O. Box 2903  
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903  
303.357.1648